

Atty Docket No. 021756-017900US

PTO FAX NO.: 1-571-270-2072

ATTENTION: Examiner Alex N. Gofman

Group Art Unit 2162

**OFFICIAL COMMUNICATION  
FOR THE PERSONAL ATTENTION OF  
EXAMINER Alex N. Gofman**

**CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**


I hereby certify that the following documents in re Application of Dmitry M. SMIRNOV et al., Application No. 10/661,167, filed September 12, 2003 for APPLICATION INTERFACE INCLUDING DYNAMIC TRANSFORM DEFINITIONS are being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Documents Attached

1. Examiner interview request form along with a continuation sheet.

Number of pages being transmitted, including this page: 3

Dated: 01/12/2011



Houtan Amanat

*PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT OF THIS PAPER BY  
RETURN FACSIMILE AT (415) 576-0300*

KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834  
Telephone: 925-472-5000  
Fax: 925-472-8895  
4836

Doc Code: M865 or FA1REQ.INTV

PTOL-413A (08-10)  
Approved for use through 07/31/2012. OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/661,167 First Named Applicant: Dmitry M. Smirnov  
 Examiner: GOFMAN, ALEX N Art Unit: 2162 Status of Application: Non-Final Office Action Mailed

## Tentative Participants:

(1) Mark Mathison (2) Houtan Amanat

(3) \_\_\_\_\_ (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: 01/12/11 Proposed Time: 2 PM EST (AM/PM)

## Type of Interview Requested:

(1)  Telephonic (2)  Personal (3)  Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated:  YES  NO

If yes, provide brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

## Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>103</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>Lee</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>103</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>Micco et al.</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Continuation Sheet Attached  Proposed Amendment or Arguments Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented: The Claimed invention will be discussed. Differences between the mentioned reference and the claimed invention will be discussed. (Please see the continuation sheet)

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_

NOTE: This form should be completed and filed by applicant in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01). If this form is signed by a registered practitioner not of record, the Office will accept this as an indication that he or she is authorized to conduct an interview on behalf of the principal (37 CFR 1.32(a)(3)) pursuant to 37 CFR 1.34. This is not a power of attorney to any above named practitioner. See the Instruction Sheet for this form, which is incorporated by reference. By signing this form, applicant or practitioner is certifying that he or she has read the Instruction Sheet. After the interview is conducted, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible. This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview.

/Houtan Amanat/

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Houtan Amanat

Examiner/SPE Signature

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

61,506

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 24 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Continuation Sheet for interview request form for application no. 10/661,167  
(021756-017900US)

- Micco fails to teach or suggest “calling a dynamic function defined in the transform definition file, the dynamic function located **elsewhere in the transform definition file** from the definition pointer position” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). Micco merely discloses:
  - deriving information about a (source language) function that would enable the appropriate target language call (made from a source file to be translated) and using the derived information to translate the source file. Therefore, Micco fails to teach or suggest “calling a dynamic function defined in the transform definition file, the dynamic function located elsewhere in the transform definition file from the definition pointer position” as recited in claim 1.
- Lee fails to teach or suggest “positioning a **definition pointer** to point at a **first compound transform definition** within a transform definition file;” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). Lee merely discloses:
  - templates indicating that a program retrieves personal information from entries in a company’s directory. Lee is silent about any pointer pointing to any part of the template and is silent about any compound transformation definition being present in the template. Therefore, Lee fails to teach or suggest “positioning a definition pointer to point at a first compound transform definition within a transform definition file” as recited in claim 1.
- The Office Action alleges that Lee’s templates are similar to transform definitions. Applicants respectfully disagree because Lee’s templates do not transform the structure of data.